REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 19, 2005, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the present application is believed to place it into condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding Office Action and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully solicited.

At the outset, the Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the issuance of a new Office Action.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Schneider et al* in view of *Weschler*. The mere fact that the prior art could have been modified in a certain way does not suffice to show that the modification would have been obvious. *In re Laskowski,* 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1397, 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Instead, the prior art must suggest the desirability of the modification. *Id.* That desirability must be shown "from positive, concrete evidence of record which justifies a combination of primary and secondary references." *Id.* Moreover,

> the examiner must show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed.

In re Rouffet, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1457 (Fed. Cir. 1998). The permissible sources for motivation are "the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art." *Id.*

Schneider et al uses an access control database in which changes are propagated to all local copies. *Weschler* teaches an improvement on LDAP queries. There would have been no reason to incorporate the LDAP queries of *Weschler* into the access control database of *Schneider et al,* since the local copies would already have the updated information. Accordingly,

the Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of references would have been pointless and therefore non-obvious, and the prior art of record does not suggest the desirability of the modification.

The Applicant further traverses the rejection of claims 28-36, 38-44, 47 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Kleinpeter III* in view of *Schneider et al.* Similarly to the arguments set forth above, the updating of the local copies in *Schneider et al* would have obviated the need for the agent server of *Kleinpeter III et al.* Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of *Schneider et al* with *Kleinpeter III et al* would have been equally non-obvious.

Finally, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 5, 6, 37, 45 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Schneider et al* in view of *Weschler* and further in view of *Kleinpeter III et al.* The combination of the three references suffers from the same deficiencies as both of the combinations of two references discussed above.

As all grounds of rejection have been addressed and overcome, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice of such allowance is respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any questions relating to this Response or to the application in general, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would telephone the undersigned attorney concerning such questions so that prosecution of this application may be expedited.

Please charge any shortage of fees or credit any overpayment thereof to BLANK ROME LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (114944-00208). In the event that a separate Petition for an Extension of Time is required to render this submission timely and either does not accompany this Response or is insufficient to render this Response timely, the Applicant herewith petitions

under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 19, 2006

By:_____
David J. Edmondson
Registration No. 35,126

CUSTOMER NO. 002779
BLANK ROME LLP
Watergate 600, 11th Floor
600 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-2485
(202) 772-5800 (Phone)
(202) 572-8398 (Facsimile)